

DRAWING AMENDMENTS

Replacement sheet 1, which includes changes to Fig. 1, has been attached as an appendix.

Attachments: One Replacement Sheet
 One Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 12-25 remain in the application. Claims 12-25 are subject to examination. Claims 12, 21, 24, and 25 have been amended.

An RCE has been filed concurrently with this response.

Fig. 1 has been amended to correct the placement of the arrow that is associated with reference numeral 32 and that identifies the raised housing section 30. Support for the change can be found by referring to Fig. 2, in which the arrow that is associated with reference numeral 32 points to the proper feature. Reference can also be made to the translated specification at page 8, lines 26-31.

Under the heading "Information Disclosure Statement" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner alleged that the IDS filed on 10/7/08 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98 (a)(3). The Examiner stated that a translation was not provided for the Japanese Office action.

The Japanese Office action, however, was not cited as prior art, and therefore does not need an explanation of relevance as required by 37 CFR 1.98 (a)(3)(i) since that section requires a concise explanation of all documents cited as prior art. The Japanese Office action was submitted to comply with 37 CFR 1.98

(a)(2)(ii), which requires the submission of documents that caused foreign patents to be listed in the IDS. The IDS filed on 10/7/08 complies with all of the requirements of 37 CFR 1.98.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 12-25 have been rejected as being obvious over Published U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0112870 A1 to Kobayashi et al. in view of European Patent application EP 0 854 666 A2 to Lochbrunner et al. and further in view of Published U.S. Patent Application 2001/0017766 to Murowaki et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Kobayashi et al. teach a casing body 5 that is formed with a flat floor, sidewall portions 53 and 54 that extend upward from the flat floor, a bottom portion 60 that extends upward from the floor in order to define the lower edge of a connector opening 56, and four support posts 52 that are used to support a printed circuit board 2. In the response to arguments section, the Examiner stated that the entire casing body 5, is being equated with the housing floor that is defined in claims 12 and 21.

The Examiner then alleged that the flat floor of the casing body 5 is an indentation. An indentation, however, is defined as a recess in a surface. The flat floor of the casing 5 is not a recess in a surface. In order to advance prosecution of this case, applicants have amended claims 12 and 21 to more

specifically define the structural features associated with the indentation.

Support for the changes can be found by referring to Fig. 1, for example.

Claim 12 now includes a housing with a housing floor formed with a first surface having an outer region, a continuous wall surrounding said outer region of said first surface, and a raised second surface being raised with respect to said first surface and extending outwardly away from said continuous wall, said wall extending from said first surface to said raised second surface. The second surface has a groove that cooperates with a projection of the housing cover. Claim 21 includes a step of providing such a housing floor.

Kobayashi et al. teach a casing body 5 with a flat bottom surface (first surface), and with outer walls formed by the sidewall portions 53 and 54, the unnumbered sidewall portion extending between the sidewall portions 53 and 54, and the bottom portion 60 extending between the sidewall portions 53 and 54. These outer walls do surround the outer region of the flat bottom surface. Kobayashi et al. also teach a flange portion 58 (second surface) that extends outwardly away from the outer walls and a groove portion 59 formed in the flange portion 58.

Claim 12 also specifies that the edge region of the printed circuit board is connected to the raised second surface of the housing floor via a heat-conducting adhesive layer. Claim 21 includes a step of pressing on the printed

circuit board in order to bond the printed circuit board on the raised second surface of the housing floor.

The printed circuit board 2 of Kobayashi et al. is not connected or bonded to the flange portion 58 (second surface), but rather is screwed to the four support posts 52 as can be seen in Fig. 1. The configuration of Kobayashi et al. does not meet the limitations of claims 12 and 21 that have been copied above.

Therefore, even if Murowaki et al. did suggest using a heat conductive adhesive layer, and even if Lochbrunner et al. did suggest placing electronic components on both sides of a printed circuit board, the invention as defined by claims 12 and 21 would not have been obtained.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 12 or 21. Claims 12 and 21 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 12 or 21.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 12-25 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Weichselbaum/
Mark P. Weichselbaum
(Reg. No. 43,248)

MPW:cgm

February 17, 2009

Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101